



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Quintus—that is, in contrast to *ita*. The form of expression is a familiar one, but an example may not be superfluous: *fac ita esse; tamen hoc ferendum nullo modo est* (Cic. Verr. II 141). And so in our passage the relation is *ita sunt . . . tamen*, and not *ingeni . . . tamen artis*, as is assumed by Tyrrell (*supra*) and others, and recently by Norden (*Antike Kunstprosa*, Vol. I, p. 182), who cites a parallel usage from Seneca Rhet.¹ Apparently Quintus had written that the verses of Lucretius were characterized by *multis luminibus ingeni*, and had either expressed the opinion or implied that they lacked in *ars*. Cicero writes in reply: Lucreti poemata ut scribis ita sunt *multis luminibus ingeni*, so far agreeing with his brother and quoting his words; but he adds in dissent *multae tamen artis*. That there was disagreement between the two in some respect is suggested by the words which follow: *Sed cum veneris*—‘but we’ll discuss the matter more fully when you come.’² Apart from the objection to *tamen* which others have felt, it would seem to me unnatural that Cicero should repeat verbatim or essentially the judgment of Quintus unless it were to express a partial dissent from it, to which, as has been said, the succeeding words point. Finally, the formula of partial agreement and exception, *ita . . . sed* or *tamen*, is so common that it seems to me a Roman reader must have grouped the words together in this manner most naturally.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

CICERO AD ATTICUM.

The postal facilities of ancient Rome were precarious at best, and it seems quite clear that Roman ideas concerning the inviolability of private letters were very much less strict than ours. We should therefore expect to find Roman letter-writers resorting to all manner of devices to render their private correspondence unintelligible to prying eyes, and there is plenty of testimony to the fact that they did so. In Cicero’s case, we have his own explicit statements. So (Ep. ad Att. II 20. 3) *de re publica breviter ad te*

¹Controv. Praef. I 17: *memoria ei natura quidem felix, plurimum tamen arte adiuta.*

²For this interpretation and punctuation of the text, which is obviously correct, cf. F. Marx, *Berl. Ph. Woch.*, 1891, col. 835. A passage of similar import and brevity of expression I owe to my colleague, Professor W. G. Hale, *Ad fam. XII 1, 2*: *Verum haec propediem et multa alia coram.*

scribam, iam enim charta ipsa ne nos prodat pertimesco: itaque posthac, si erunt mihi plura ad te scribenda, ἀλληγορίαις obscurabo.

Another suggestion is made by Cicero Att. II 19. 5. (posthac ad te aut, si perfidelem habebo cui dem, scribam plane omnia, aut, si obscure scribam, tu tamen intelleges; in eis epistolis me Laelium, te Furium faciam; cetera erunt ἐν αἰνιγμοῖς,) and modified in the next letter. (II 20. 5 quod scripseram me¹ Furio scripturum, nihil necesse est tuum nomen mutare. Me faciam Laelium et te Atticum, neque utar meo chirographo neque signo, si modo erunt eiusmodi litterae, quas in alienum incidere nolim.)

The two periods of Cicero's life when such precautions would have been most needful, for Atticus' sake if not for his own, were the months of his exile (696-7) and those which elapsed between the June day 706 when he finally followed Pompey over seas and his pardon by Cæsar more than a year after the battle of Pharsalia. These letters comprise the third and eleventh books *ad Atticum*.

Turning now to the internal evidence of the text, we are struck by the entire absence in these two books of those Greek epithets and quotations which occur so frequently in most of the other letters to Atticus. We know from Att. X 8. 1. that Cicero's ever prudent friend felt so keenly the danger which attended their correspondence in 705 as to have doubted the desirability of writing at all, and we know that Cicero disregarded the delicate intimation even while admitting its wisdom. Still harder would it have been for him in 696 or 707 to deny himself such an outlet for his conflicting emotions as was afforded by these most free and intimate epistolary outpourings; and that he compromised the matter by employing a cipher seems at least a plausible theory.

We need not suppose that he is referring to the comparative laboriousness of following a code, when he makes use—as he does so often at these times—of such phrases as *plura scribere non possum* and *non quo plura scribere*, and still less that he was too much disturbed in mind during those trying times to have the patience requisite for employing a difficult cipher, for he undoubtedly had at hand an expert amanuensis, who possessed the key to all his "enigmas," and who was able to use the most complex. But might we not satisfactorily explain the absence of Greek words by supposing that he adopted some such simple expedient as that of moving the letters of the Latin alphabet a certain number of

¹ Reading of M., variously altered by editors who have thought emendation necessary.

places forward or back? Greek words could not have been left intact on such a page, for their significance would have been suggestive to the inquisitive reader, while, if they too had been transposed, according to the code, but in their own alphabet, the small, isolated groups of foreign characters must have given the clue to the cipher. Nor could the letters of the Greek words have been transposed and then written in Latin characters, because of the different order in which the letters occur in the two alphabets as well as the presence in the Greek of the double-consonant symbols. The only feasible way would have been to keep to the vernacular, as Cicero has done in the third and eleventh books.

LOUISE DODGE.

MAMATPAI.

In the current volume of this Journal XXII, p. 195 foll., two American scholars have tried with greater or less probability to carry back to their Indian original form a number of Indian glosses in the Lexicon of Hesychios. With respect to one of them *μαμάτραι οἱ στρατηγοὶ παρ' Ἰνδοῖς*, I would propose another explanation which gives both a simpler account of the word itself and one more in accordance with phonetics. In my opinion, *μαμάτραι* represents Skrt. *mahāmātrāḥ*, a well-known term to denote a minister of high rank. *Mahāmātrāḥ samṛddhe cāmātye hastipakā dhiṣe*. 'Mahāmātra signifies as well a high minister as an elephant-driver.' So the Medinikośa. In literature the word is very common in both acceptations. In the Amarakośa commentary found in the edition of Vamanacharya Jhalakikar, Bombay, 1890, the right etymology is given (p. 181) *mahati mātrā yeṣāṃ te mahāmātrāḥ*. Its translation by *στρατηγοὶ* may have been made by Megasthenes or some other source of information about Indian matters in the time of the Diadochoi; and as *στρατηγός* is employed in a wider sense than to denote mere military power, it may have been considered an adequate term for rendering tolerably well the name by which the Indian high officials were designated. Cp. *στρατηγός* as equivalent of the Roman *praetor*. That *mahāmātra* in Greek transcription must become *μαμάτραι* (as to the accent, cp. *mātrā*), is almost evident.

GRONINGEN.

J. S. SPEYER.